



BARNES & THORNBURG

11 South Meridian Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
(317) 236-1313
(317) 231-7433 Fax

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2837
#5/A
7-17-03
1-27-03

Group: 2831
Confirmation No.: 7528
Application No.: 09/982,154
Invention: HIGH VOLTAGE CABLE
Applicant: Brian E. Gorrell
Filed: October 18, 2001
Attorney
Docket: 3030-69081
Examiner: William H. Mayo III

Certificate Under 37 CFR 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231

on January 6, 2003
Kim Tyree
(Signature)

Kim Tyree

(Printed Name)

RECEIVED
JAN 15 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

RESPONSE

BOX Non-Fee Amendment
Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the official action issued October 4, 2002, please consider the following comments. The Examiner rejected claims 1-10, 13, 14, 17, 19 and 20 under 35 U. S. C. § 102. The Examiner relied upon Hastings U. S. Patent 4,739,935 (hereinafter Hastings) to support this rejection.

However, claim 1, from which the remaining rejected claims depend either directly or indirectly, specifically recites "[a] high voltage cable including a fiber core, a first layer of an electrically relatively non-insulative polymer, a second layer of an electrically relatively non-conductive polymer, a third layer of an electrically relatively non-insulative polymer, a fourth layer including a metal braid shield, and a fifth layer including a relatively solvent- and abrasive-resistant polymer jacket." Hastings' fiber core 40, is surrounded by wound insulative polyester thread 42, and a carbon-loaded layer 44 having a resistivity of 10^6 - $10^8 \Omega$ -cm,

preferably $10^7 \Omega\text{-cm}$. Thus, the construction of the first two layers 42, 44 around the core 40 of Hastings' cable 20 is the opposite of the claimed construction. Accordingly, the 35 U. S. C. § 102 rejection of claims 1-10, 13, 14, 17, 19 and 20 is overcome. Nor is there any suggestion of the desirability of reversing Hastings' layers 42 and 44, since Hastings' layer 42 is intended to be the improvement of Hastings, designed to reduce the likelihood that broken ends of the very fine fibers of Hastings' core 40 will poke out and form undesirable high voltage gradients with the potential for electrical stress and corona discharge degradation of the remaining layers of Hastings' cable 20 structure.

The Examiner rejected claims 11, 12, 15, 16 and 18 under 35 U. S. C. § 103. The Examiner relied upon Hastings to support this rejection. For at least the reasons noted above, explaining a significant deficiency in the teachings of Hastings, Hastings neither discloses nor suggests the combinations claimed in claims 11, 12, 15, 16 and 18 which depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that his claims 1-20 are in condition for favorable consideration, culminating in allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees which may be necessary to constitute this a timely response to the October 4, 2002 official action, or credit any overpayment, to Applicant's undersigned counsel's deposit account 10-0435 with reference to our file 3030-69081. A duplicate copy of this authorization is enclosed. Accordingly, Applicant submits that this application is in condition for favorable consideration, culminating in allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard D. Conard
Attorney Reg. No. 27321
Attorney for Applicant

RDC/kat
Indianapolis, Indiana
(317)231-7285
INDS02 RDC 557357